

**REMARKS**

Claims 11-17 are pending in the application with claims 11, 15, 16 amended and new claim 17 added by these amendments.

In the final office action, claims 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,628,632 to Dolan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,547 to Yamashita. It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 11, 15, and 16 patentably distinguish over the cited portions of Dolan and Yamashita for at least the following reasons:

As best understood, the relied upon portions of Dolan do not teach the use of identification information, which is allotted to a radio terminal. Further Dolan fails to teach the maintaining of identification information allotted to the radio terminal when handing off between a first and second base station.

As to Yamashita, it is respectfully submitted that the relied upon portions of the cited reference fail to teach “renewing of the identification information” as recited in claims 11, 15, and 16, as amended, from the third base station.

Further, it is respectfully pointed out that the Examiner has failed to specifically point out what portion of the cited reference is relied upon to allege the teaching of the renewed identification of the present invention as claimed.

Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that the rationale behind the remarks included in the Advisory Action of November 19, 2007 is unclear. At the very least it is submitted that the Examiner has read much more into the benign assertions in Dolan at col. 8 lines 53-56 than warranted by this passage in the reference. This portion of Dolan appears to reference the identity and address of the “nth order neighbor base stations.” In contrast, the identification

information of the present claims refers to identification information allotted to the radio terminal. Contrary to the assertion in the advisory action the identification information is not “omitted” rather there is just no need to renew it when moving from a first base station to a second base station. This is clarified by reference to Fig. 2 and page 13 of the instant specification.

Moreover, the Examiner’s remarks appear to indicate particular reliance on that portion of col. 8 lines 53-56 where it states “further description is omitted for the sake of brevity.” But by reliance on this statement it is unclear exactly what the Examiner is relying upon to assert that Dolan teaches certain elements of the instant claims. To the extent the Examiner continues to rely on Dolan, he is requested to provide a complete statement of where each and every element alleged to be found therein can be found in the reference.

In view of the forgoing amendments and remarks , it is submitted that neither Dolan nor Yamashita, whether cited alone or in combination teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 11, 15, or 16 as amended. Therefore claims 11, 15, and 16 patentably distinguishes over the relied upon portions of Dolan and Yamashita and is allowable. Claims 12-14 and 17, which depend from one of these base claims are allowable therewith.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan Weber/  
Nathan Weber  
Reg. No. 50,958

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304  
Telephone: (212) 940-8564  
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987  
Docket No.: 100794-00558 (FUJX 20.963)  
NW:cc